

ay



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,727	06/29/2001	Hsinchao Liao		8720

7590 08/15/2005
HSINCHAO LIAO
P. O. BOX 5644
BERKELEY, CA 94705-0644

EXAMINER

CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/896,727	Applicant(s) LIAO, HSINCHAO	
	Examiner Sumaiya A. Chowdhury	Art Unit 2611	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sumaiya A. Chowdhury.

(3) Hsinchao Liao.

(2) Chris Grant (SPE).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 August 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 & 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Inoue & Shimakawa.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the invention in relation to the claims 1, 10 and figure 1. The examiner explained that the claims were rejected under the combination of Inoue and Shimakawa. The pro se inventor provided information (attached) including changes to the claims (via email). However, we believe that the changes are minor and they do not overcome the references of record. Additionally, Mr. Liao was informed that item b "FM-subcarriers and satellite radio" on page 1 of the proposed claim sheet is new matter and that the amended claims cannot include new matter. Mr. Liao was advised to obtain an attorney to prosecute the application.

claims

Hsinchao Liao
09/896,727

Claim 1: To distinguish this claim from Inoue, I admit one of four restrictions.

- a. Restrict "digital data from broadcast" to "text data from broadcast". With this restriction, I must add a dependent claim that "said text data is compressed."
- b. Restrict broadcast to "broadcast selected from the group consisting of FM-subcarriers and satellite radio."
- c. Restrict "digital data" to "data selected from the group consisting of financial data, sports data, local traffic data, news summaries and local weather data."
- d. Explicitly define "personalization" as "filtration of said received data and computations based on said received data according to preconfigured rules."

The main distinction here is that continuous broadcast of text data guarantees useful personalization at all times. Inoue's brief description can only be interpreted as "some data may be available some of the time", and Inoue makes no reference to personalization.

Claim 2, 3: A computer that loads software from floppy disc exists. Neither Inoue nor I make these claims independently. I claim the usage only in conjunction with the specific device of claim 1.

Claim 5: Inoue's (required) video display must be a television. My (optional) video display can be as simple as the LCD display of a car stereo. This claim is dependent upon claim 1.

Claim 10:

- a. Inoue does NOT disclose any personalization system. That Inoue's system may receive (some) stock quotes (some of the time) and that the user may be able to do something with what is received -- that is not a description of a personalization system.
- b. My "interactive computer" is a PC that one uses to program a compact flash card, which (the card) one then plugs into one's car stereo (the mobile receiver unit). By "[interactive computer] including an interface for accessing a removable storage device", I simply meant that the computer includes or is connected to a card reader. It is a misunderstanding to infer that the interactive computer includes a remote controller interface.

What Inoue says is this: when the receiver receives and displays interesting data, like a stunning photo, the user may interactively use the remote controller to instruct the receiver to save said interesting data to the compact flash card. On the other hand, when my mobile receiver interacts with the compact flash card, neither is interactively controlled. See claim 11 below, which may identify the source of the confusion.

Claim 11: Inoue's invention is a set top box that acts as both the receiver and the interactive computer (called "interactive receiver" from now on). In my invention, the receiver is (usually) not interactive and must be distinct and separate from the interactive computer, which may include Inoue's invention, in parts or entirely.

claims

Claim 12, 14: Any PC writes parameters and programs to removable media such as CD-ROM and floppy discs. Neither Inoue nor I make no such claim independently.

Inoue's apparatus saves interesting data to the compact flash card. It does not write executable software to the compact flash card. The executable software programs such as the browser resides on the compact flash card, but how such programs become stored in the compact flash card is unspecified. (See claim 16).

In any case, as stated previously,

a) My receiver is separate from the interactive computer. Inoue's apparatus is an interactive receiver.

b) My interactive computer is a PC, which of course can write just about anything to any media attached to it.

Claim 15: Yes, Inoue's interactive receiver can connect to the Internet just like any PC or more similarly, the webTV device. It can save any data it receives to any device attached to it.

I claim specifically the use of a PC to download data for use with a separate receiver.

Claim 16: Inoue specifies that the interactive receiver can be programmed and programs can be written. But Inoue does not actually describe how such programs can be written. Rather Inoue specifies that programs (to be executed by the interactive receiver) can be purchased from vendors to interpret various data (Inoue column 10, lines 31 to 39).

In my invention, the PC can be programmed anyway a programmer desires. In particular, I claim the programming of the PC to store personalization parameters and executable programs for use with a separate receiver.

Claim 4: Any receiver device can have a "signal ready alert." Even a stereo amplifier can detect and alert when audio signal is present. None of the inventors named by the examiner makes this claim independently. I claim its usage in conjunction with a specific device.

Sezan's intelligent agent is indeed much more sophisticated. My device simply alerts the user to turn up the speaker volume when the signal is stable.

Claim 6,7: Pacing means has been invented for various devices, for example, devices that read electronic books to the blind at selectable paces. For this reason, none of the inventors named by the examiner makes (selectable) pacing means an independent claim.

I claim pacing means for a specific mobile receiver unit.

Other inventors cited by the examiner make use of the "frame frequency" or "refresh rate" of the TV (and the CRT). My device does not depend on such framing and refreshing except in the embodiment where signal is transmitted through TV broadcast. (Using FM subcarriers or satellite radio, frame refreshing is irrelevant).

Claim 13: Synchronizing data across multiple devices is not novel. For example, one can synchronize personal calendars among Yahoo Calendar, Microsoft Outlook and the Palm Pilot. Thus Sezan's "user

claims
description scheme", and in particular its storage on removable devices is not novel and should be disallowed as independent claim.

I, on the other hand, make this dependent claim only for use with specific devices and data types.

Sezan's claims that involve "system description scheme" and "program description scheme" are irrelevant. My mobile receiver unit requires and prefers no such self-description schemes, neither does regular TV programming nor FM broadcast.

Sezan's personalization of the car stereo involves tuning the radio to preset stations at preset times, not the filtering of broadcast text data.

It is plain that Sezan's user, system, and program description schemes achieve nothing by themselves. Sezan's Search, Filtering and Browsing module (SFB) is the essential component that makes these schemes (and the patent) useful. However, Sezan discloses neither standard interfaces required by the SFB nor novel techniques employed the SFB in terms flow charts and pseudo code. Thus any capabilities of the SFB, whether or not mentioned by Sezan, are either speculations or trade secrets, neither covered by Sezan's patent. Furthermore, without full disclosure of the SFB, no device, including my mobile receiver unit, can be declared to infringe upon the SFB.

Claim 8: Voice synthesizers are not novel, and are readily available as software or hardware. None of the inventors cited by me or the examiner make this claim independently. I claim the use of a voice synthesizer with a specific mobile receiver device.

Claim 9: Hendricks device can be connected to a radio tuner via some interface the same way the said tuner can be connected to an audio amplifier, for example, using cables.

My claim should be interpreted to mean that the personalization circuitry can be embedded into a car stereo or any (audio) radio receiver.

discuss

Hsinchao Liao
09/896,727

Description of my invention

If you go to my.yahoo.com, you can set up a page that displays only the sports teams that and stocks that you care about. This page refreshes regularly to keep the you updated on the scores and the quotes. My invention duplicates this functionality in a mobile setting. This is how it works.

1. Using a PC (interactive computer), go to my.yahoo.com and set up your personalized screen.
2. Download this personalization configuration to a compact flash card (removable storage device). This might be a plain text file containing the text: "STOCKS: INTC, MSFT; BASEBALL: WASHINGTON NATIONALS; FOOTBALL: REDSKINS".
3. Plug this compact flash card into a car stereo (mobile receiver unit), which receive digital broadcast through FM subcarriers or satellite radio. Quotes for INTC and MSFT, scores for the Nationals and the Redskins are updated every few minutes, and announced continuously and repeatedly.

This is the extent of my invention. Notice these special features.

1. The data you get in your car is exactly the same as your personalized my.yahoo.com page.
2. There is minimal user interaction with the mobile unit. You plug in the compact flash card, select the broadcast channel, and perhaps adjust the volume.
3. The (optional) video display consists of the existing small LCD that comes with any car stereo.
4. The size of the receiver unit is no larger than the smallest digital camera, in addition to the size of car stereo, or portable stereo such as the Sony Walkman.

Discussion of Inoue's patent (6,580,462)

Old TV cannot be used to process new types of content, such as games, digital broadcast and web pages. Inoue addresses this issue by attaching a receiver device to the TV that fulfills these functionalities. Here are some of its features.

1. Receiver can decode many types of video, photo and audio formats, and can store them on a compact flash card.
2. Receiver can also playback any video, photo and audio data stored on a compact flash card.
3. Receiver can be interactively controlled using a remote controller.
4. Receiver can execute all kinds of different programs that it loads from the compact flash card. One of them is the browser, which potentially must be operated interactively. Other programs may extract stock information from broadcast and display them.

discuss

Incompatibilities

1. Inoue is concerned with audio/video data. My device is concerned with purely textual data. Compressed audio/video are lossy. However, text can be compressed losslessly and efficiently.

** If required, I can revise my claim so that my mobile receiver unit "receives text data from broadcast."

2. Inoue makes no claim to personalization.
Inoue makes no claim to the availability of personalizable data.
Inoue makes no claim to the availability of personalization software.

-- The examiner cites Inoue's Column 10, lines 30-40 as claim to personalization. Inoue neither uses nor defines the word "personalization." Inoue describes software that extracts stock quotes as an example of software that extracts data, but Inoue makes no claim on how the extracted data is "personalized". For example, can Inoue's device display stock quotes in flashing red and announce them with the simulated voice of Barbra Streisand? How does an user communicate such preferences to Inoue's device? As another example, anyone can "personalize" his television set by placing a family portrait on top of it. Because his TV viewing experience is now different from another viewer's, his TV is "personalized."

Personalization cannot be inferred. It must be explicitly stated. In my invention, I define "personalization" as "filtration of data and computations based on said data according to preconfigured rules".

-- Inoue's stock quote example provides neither a performance guarantee or a completeness guarantee. It is unknown which stocks or how many stocks can be or will be broadcasted, or when and how often they can be or will be broadcasted. Whether Inoue's stock extraction system is practical is entirely in doubt.

On the other hand, the embodiment of my invention that uses FM carriers (8 kilobits per second with error correction) guarantees to broadcast all 2800 stocks on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) within 1 minute without compression, and within 30 seconds with compression. For example, one can compress the stock symbols simply by assigning a number from 1 to 2800 for each stock. A stock symbol consisting of four characters is thus reduced to 12 bits. Lossless compression of such efficiency does not exist for broadcast systems based on audio, video or images.

Using more advanced broadcast systems such as satellite radio, my receiver can extract all publicly traded securities on the NYSE, AMEX and NASDAQ, and scores for all of professional sports within a few minutes.

Digital broadcast (of books, stock quotes, traffic information) using FM subcarriers have been used extensively for at least twenty years. I do not claim to have invented it. I claim to invent a type of receiver of such data that can be pre-programmed to filter the data received, derive information from said filtered data, and present said filtered data and said

discuss

derived information in pre-configured fashion. The receiver is pre-configured through the use of a removable media so that its user does not need to interact with the receiver while driving a car or jogging on city streets. Thus my invention is strictly defined with no ambiguity, and provably efficient and practical.

- Inoue's users must obtain browsers and stock extraction software from vendors. Inoue makes no claim as to how the software can be produced and loaded onto the compact flash card, and how the software may be customized to perform personalization, a concept that Inoue never mentioned. It is unknown whether any vendor will make any such stock extraction software available to the users of Inoue's system.

My invention specifies personalization to be a built-in functionality of the receiver, independent of any additional software provided by any vendor. Personalization will always be available as long as data is received.

- Devices that executes programs stored on external devices have been in existence for more than 30 years, e.g. computers that executes programs stored on punch cards, tapes, floppy discs or CDs. Any implicit inference on the existence or capabilities of any software (whether or not loaded from removable media) infringes on general computing. Thus the inventor must define this "preprogrammed non-interactive personalization through removable media" claim explicitly and procedurally to avoid such an infringement. Inoue does not do so.

3. The examiner compares Inoue's "remote controller" with my "interactive computer including an interface for accessing a removable storage device." This is a simple misunderstanding. I was simply stating that the "interactive computer includes or is connected to a compact flash card reader." However "card" was too restricted as floppy discs and CD-ROMs too are removable storage devices. I do not claim to invent a computer with a card reader. I merely claim its application in programming the card for use with the mobile receiver.

- Inoue's device can be connected to a modem. It indeed does not need another interactive computer.
- Inoue's remote controller is similar to that used with a VCR or a TV. My device does not need a remote controller because the user should not be customizing the car stereo while driving.
- My interactive computer is the computer you view my.yahoo.com with. You use this computer to pre-program the compact flash card, which you will plug into the car stereo.
- The main distinction is this: Inoue's invention is a programmable interactive receiver, essentially a full-blown personal computer with a receiver (or a receiver with a PC). In contrast, my receiver unit has a mostly non-interactive embedded computer that executes instructions stored on a memory card. The memory card is programmed by a separate interactive computer such as Inoue's device.

4. Any invention based on the encoding of data during vertical refresh of the CRT is not usable with general receivers of digital text. For example, new LCD displays do not require vertical refresh because they do not use a sweeping electron gun. And in particular, digital data encoded within FM subcarriers or digital

discuss
radio (used by embodiments of my invention) cannot be received by a receiver designed for the CRT or traditional television set that rely on vertical refresh.

Discussion of Shimakawa's Patent (6,452,644)

Shimakawa's claims a method of broadcast encoding suitable for mobile receivers. I claim an apparatus and a method for "personalizing" the data received by Shimakawa's or any other receiver. My objections to your reference to Shimakawa's patent are the same as those to Inoue's.

1. Shimakawa does not use or define "personalization".
2. Shimakawa's receiver device uses a remote controller similar to Inoue's. Such user interface may be used by the passengers, but not by the vehicle's operator for safety reasons.

My receiver is pre-programmed for personalization by the compact flash card. Each person in the vehicle may change the personalization settings by replacing the compact flash card with a different one.

3. Shimakawa's receiver obtains controller software from the broadcast signal. While this method may allow the "system" to customize the presentation of data to some extent, the user's experience is not personalized because every user obtains the same software that makes the same customized presentation. Further customizations can only be achieved interactively by using the remote controller.

Discussion of Sezan's Patent (6,236,395)

Sezan's "User Description Scheme" is defined for a broad class of devices and can be used for some forms of personalization, including video display contrast level, favorite TV channels, radio stations, Internet bookmarks, geographic and demographic information.

One may be misled to conclude that any skilled engineer can easily modify Sezan's systems into my invention. I offer objections below.

1. Sezan's "user description scheme" does not work with my mobile receiver units which requires and provides no "program description scheme" and no "system description scheme". My broadcast of all stock quotes and all sports scores provide no program description other than station identification and the data itself. Any additional information for Sezan's purpose of browsing and searching are detrimental to system performance, and therefore impractical.

In essence, I do not infringe any of Sezan's claims that include either the "system description scheme" or the "program description scheme" because my invention requires and prefers no such schemes.

2. We all have used floppy discs, CD-ROMs and other removable media to store personal information for more than a decade. In attempt to avoid infringing upon the general purpose of removable storage devices, Sezan restricts the storage of "user description scheme" on a smart card by identifying special (specific) pieces of personal information: Television channels, radio presets, display contrast, age, zip code, programming keywords, favorite video

discuss
feature, favorite performers, etc. (Sezan column 11, lines 7 to 22).

while my devices may use zip code for personalizing local traffic and news, I can substitute telephone area codes, United Nations location codes, or longitudes and latitudes. My personalization of the removable storage device have otherwise no commonality with Sezan's.

Most relevantly, Sezan explains that car stereos may be personalized to tune to preset stations at predetermined times (Sezan column 11, lines 23 to 25). Sezan does not fathom the possibility the radio broadcast may contain digital text to be personalized.

Nevertheless, by itself, the method of storing of personal information (including user preferences) on removable media is not novel. Also the idea that removable media be compatible with multiple devices is not novel. For example, the same compact flash card is shared by the computer, the digital camera and the MP3 player. The same calendar can be synchronized among Yahoo calendar, Microsoft Outlook, mobile phone and Palm Pilot using various cables and media. This is why I do not claim independently the use of the removable storage device for user description. I only claim (1) its personalized usage in conjunction with a mobile receiver unit and (2) its personalized usage in conjunction with a mobile receiver unit and a Internet-capable personal computer.

Structured descriptions of users, devices and programs are not novel. Usefulness of these descriptions come from the methods that utilize them. For example, many USB devices automatically install themselves to a PC running Microsoft Windows by describing themselves using a standard protocol shared by the device and the PC. (On the other hand, the verbal descriptions of an elephant is useless to a blind man, as a verbal descriptions of an elephant in Swahili is useless to an Eskimo). Sezan's Search, Filtering and Browsing (SFB) module is the essential component makes the patent useful (Sezan column 9, lines 9 to 25). However, Sezan does not disclose any standard interface among the descriptions and the SFB module, or novel techniques used by the SFB module. It is plain that these description schemes achieve nothing by themselves. But without detailed descriptions such as flow charts and pseudo code, the capabilities of the SFB module are either speculations or trade secrets, neither are patented.

I must also point out that display contrast setting cannot be shared among different displays. The variability of physical components dictates that even two units of the same product have slightly different display behaviors. Sezan's various displays can only be personalized sensibly using the same setting if they are self-calibrating with respect to either a constant and common light source or the user's optical nerves. Sezan discloses no such self-calibrating display. It may be more plausible that each display's settings are stored separately, even if they are stored on the same smart card. Thus the concept that the "user description scheme" is independent of the device ("system description scheme") needs to be qualified and clarified.

Discussion of Beach's patent (6,901,270)

Beach invents a system where voice commands are recognized by a mobile

discuss

unit and transferred to a central computer. The central computer responds with data that may be turned into voice.

Neither Beach nor I claim to have invented a method for converting digital signals to speech, for such technology has already been invented and implemented (for example, by Nuance Inc and Speechworks Inc). Beach and I both include speech synthesis technology as components of our devices. We do not infringe upon each other.

The key differences between Beach's mobile device and mine are: (1) My device is not interactive. (2) My device receives data from broadcast whereas Beach's device requests and receives specific data.

Discussion of Hendricks' patent (6,557,173)

Hendricks' patent involves an electronic viewer which organizes many channels of TV programming for the user's convenience. It also allows the user to read electronic books.

The objection that I infringe upon Hendrick's description of attaching a radio tuner to the set top box is a misunderstanding. Hendrick does not claim to invent such a method. Hendricks simply explains that a radio tuner can be connected to a set top box like it can be connected to a stereo amplifier, in the same way a CD player, a DVD player, cassette deck, stereo receiver, computers etc can all be connected together using cables.

In contrast, one embodiment of my mobile receiver unit INCLUDES the radio tuner because the data is transmitted using FM broadcast. When the FM signal is demodulated, the analog signal is interpreted by the normal FM decoder section of the circuit while the digital signal is personalized. The user chooses either analog content (normal radio) or personalized digital content by flipping a switch. (This switch is the only user interface component that I claim). By "attachment" I meant that a normal car stereo's circuit is modified to include a digital signal decoder and a personalization module. I do not claim the encoding of digital signals in FM/AM/TV/Satellite broadcast, nor do I claim the circuits and methods decoding of such signals. I only claim the personalization module and its inclusion in "traditional" receiver devices.